

involvement. We must also ensure that Federal Government programs that are meant to combat drug use really do work.

There are those in this body who have advocated spending hundreds of millions of dollars on increased drug treatment. Treatment is very valuable, but don't we get more for our money if we prevent individuals from using and becoming addicted to drugs in the first place.

President Bush has made a commitment to reducing drug abuse in America. In order to achieve this goal he has nominated a strong candidate in Mr. Walters. I believe that Mr. Walters will provide the strong leadership we so desperately need.

President Bush's approach will focus on reducing the demand for drugs through effective education, prevention, treatment, and law enforcement.

President Bush has nominated Mr. Walters for this position because he is an experienced leader in reducing the demand for and supply of drugs. John Walters was indeed a major catalyst for the successes achieved during the Reagan-Bush years. Indeed during his tenure as Assistant to our Drug Czar, Bill Bennett, America saw a marked and dramatic reduction in drug use. The war on drugs was not a failure, it was one success after another.

Some members of the press have focused on Mr. Walters experience in interdiction and law enforcement, but he actually started in public service at the Department of Education, specializing in drug abuse prevention, including writing and taking a lead on the "Schools Without Drugs" prevention and education program.

Mr. Walters went on to serve as the ONDCP chief of staff in the first Bush administration and later was confirmed by the Senate as deputy director. We achieved some of our greatest victories under his watch. It is obvious he has the qualifications and experience for the job.

William Bennett, the former director of ONDCP and Mr. Walters former boss while he was at the agency, has said "John is the best person for the job. He is one of the three or four most knowledgeable people about the issue and he has a deep passion about the job of stopping illegal drugs."

Now more than ever we need strong leadership. The Director of ONDCP coordinates all Federal anti-drug efforts, but it is also important that the Director work more effectively to support State and local efforts. President Bush's plan stresses this aspect.

Let me give you an example of the crisis we face. Last year a study was released by the National Center for Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University. According to the study, adolescents in small-town and rural America are much more likely than their peers in urban areas to have used drugs.

The study reports that 8th-graders in rural areas are 104 percent likelier than

those in big cities to use amphetamines, including methamphetamines, and 50 percent likelier to use cocaine.

Law enforcement officials in Alabama have come to me with major concerns about increased drug use and trafficking in the rural parts of the South, particularly an alarming rise in Methamphetamine use and production.

We must take steps to reverse this alarming trend. We need solid leadership at the Office of National Drug Control Policy to address this issue. One area where Mr. Walters can have a major impact on this problem is in regards to the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area or HIDTA program.

The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 authorized the Director of ONDCP to designate areas within the United States which exhibit serious drug trafficking problems and harmfully impact other areas of the country as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas.

The HIDTA program provides additional Federal funds to those areas to help eliminate or reduce drug trafficking and its harmful consequences. The program enhances and coordinates drug control efforts among local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies.

The House and Senate Appropriations Committees have passed increases for the HIDTA program in both versions of the Treasury Postal Appropriations bills. Much of these funds will be left to the discretion of the director of ONDCP.

We need immediate, strong, and competent leadership at ONDCP to ensure that issues like this are properly addressed. The funding must flow to the areas with the most need, where law enforcement can make a real difference. Mr. Walters has the knowledge and expertise to make these types of important decisions.

Mr. Walters can also provide strong leadership in our overall Federal efforts. Our Federal campaign against drugs is spread over a number of agencies, including the Justice, Treasury, and Defense Departments. We need strong leadership to ensure that these efforts are coordinated. I have become concerned in recent months that perhaps some of these agencies efforts have become repetitive.

I have requested that the GAO study these efforts to ensure that is not happening. Mr. Walters has the expertise to take a close look at all our efforts to ensure that our dollars are being sent wisely.

I believe we can make a real difference in the problems with drugs in America. Under President Bush and Mr. Walters leadership, I know we can send a clear message to our youth that drugs use is dangerous and just plain wrong. We can also send a clear message to drug dealers, that there activities will not be tolerated.

I urge my colleagues to move toward confirmation of John Walters nomination. This is not an area where we can afford to delay.

KOREAN GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise today to express my extreme concern about developments in the Republic of Korea that have far reaching negative implications for U.S. semiconductor companies. I am referring to the massive and unjustified government bailout that the South Korean government is providing to Hyundai Electronics, now known as Hynix.

To date, the South Korean Government and the government-owned banks have given Hynix over \$4 billion in loans and other types of financing which carry the guarantee of the government of Korea. This is a subsidy pure and simple. As if this is not bad enough, however, two Wall Street Journal articles over the past week report that the Korean government is now planning on giving Hynix an additional billion dollars to keep them solvent.

In the year 2000, Hynix was the world's largest producer of dynamic random access memory, or DRAM, an important type of memory semiconductor that is used in everything from personal computers to satellites. Hynix has captured over 24 percent of the world semiconductor market. However, Hynix achieved such a large share of the global market not because it is particularly good at making DRAMs, but because it borrowed excessively and built up enormous capacity.

Now, Hynix is broke and cannot repay the loans it took out to finance its expansion. Verging on bankruptcy, Hynix has been kept alive by the South Korean government through infusions of new cash. Far from solving the company's problems, however, these government subsidies are just plunging Hynix deeper into debt. This behavior circumvents normal market forces and has very severe implications for the companies in the U.S. and the rest of the world that are forced to compete with Hynix's illegally subsidized products.

Over the past several months, the Korean government has given assurances to me, to my colleague Senator CRAPO, and other members of this body, as well as Ambassador Zoellick, Secretary Evans and Secretary O'Neill, that the Korean government will stop giving these subsidies to Hynix, subsidies that clearly violate our international trade agreements. Now, the Korean government seems poised to violate these assurances completely, destroying the U.S. semiconductor industry in the process.

I call on the Korean government to stop subsidizing Hynix, to stop this distortion of the international semiconductor market, and to let Hynix sink or swim on its own.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, as we are all aware, the Internet has revolutionized communication and business. Unfortunately, it also provides a new tool for some very traditional villains: child molesters. While it is already a Federal crime to cross State

lines to sexually molest a minor, in recent years the number of people using the Internet to violate this law has skyrocketed. According to a report issued to Congress last year by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, NCMEC, one in five children, aged 10-17, were sexually solicited over the Internet in 1999. And from 1998-2000 alone, the FBI's cybermolester case-load increased by 550 percent.

Unfortunately, loopholes in the current law allow some of these predators to escape without any real consequences. Because most cybermolesters are well-educated, middle-class, and have no previous criminal record, many judges are giving them laughably light sentences. Ironically, the purveyors of child-pornography receive mandatory ten-year sentences, but those who use the Internet to meet children and act out pornographic fantasies often receive no jail time at all.

We need to end the double standard that gives lighter sentences to a special set of privileged criminals. For this reason, last week I re-introduced my Cybermolesters Enforcement Act to ensure that these new on-line molesters are apprehended and brought to justice. Like last year, my bill provides for a five-year mandatory minimum sentence for those who abuse the Internet in an effort to sexually abuse America's children, but it does not change the maximum sentence provided by Federal law.

This year, the bill contains two additional provisions to help the Bureau apprehend these abusers and destroy their disgusting wares. First, my bill would allow law enforcement to obtain a Federal wiretap on those suspected of committing certain child sexual exploitation offenses, such as transmitting computer-generated child pornography, enticing a minor to travel for sexual activity, or transporting a minor for sexual activity. Adding these offenses to the list of crimes for which Federal law enforcement may obtain wiretaps will significantly increase the ability of the authorities to detect and interdict those who use the Internet to send pornography to minors and then arrange to meet them for unlawful sexual activity. As with any other wiretap request, though, the government first must demonstrate probable cause to the satisfaction of a Federal judge in order to use this important tool.

Second, this year my bill would classify child pornography as contraband. Illegal drugs and counterfeit currency are already defined as contraband, and child pornography is at least as dangerous to our society. Classifying child pornography as contraband would enable law enforcement officials to seize it based upon probable cause and destroy it automatically after its use as evidence is no longer needed. Furthermore, treating this odious material as contraband will likely lead to increased cooperation from commercial entities, such as Internet service pro-

viders, which are unwittingly used by child pornographers to store and transmit this disgusting material. Because no customer can claim a legitimate property interest in contraband, these entities will be free to seize child pornography, delete its presence on the Internet, and send the images to law enforcement without fear of civil liability from their customers.

The Cybermolesters Enforcement Act addresses a real and chilling threat to our Nation's children. It will support the FBI's "Innocent Images" program, which is on the front lines of the battle against on-line pedophiles. Both Ernie Allen, President of the NCMEC, and by John Walsh of "America's Most Wanted" have endorsed it. "Predators are hiding behind the relative anonymity of the Internet to target children," said Mr. Allen. "While we're making enormous progress in addressing this problem, it is clear that too many of these cases are not being viewed in a serious way by the courts. Senator McCONNELL's bill sends a loud, clear message that enticing children for sexual purposes over the Internet is just as illegal and just as dangerous as doing it in a shopping mall or playground," said Allen. And John Walsh notes that "yesterday's child molesters are today's cybermolesters. Senator McCONNELL's bill is a comprehensive approach to fighting these despicable crimes. It helps the FBI track down these criminals, allows the Bureau to seize their perverse wares, and makes sure we do not let them escape justice."

I urge my colleagues to support this initiative, and I ask unanimous consent that this article by George Will outlining the problem of cybermolesters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 23, 2000]

NASTY WORK

(By George F. Will)

To visit a crime scene, turn on your computer. Log on to a list of "bulletin boards" or real-time chat rooms, which come and go rapidly. Look for names like "Ilovemuchyoungerf" ("f" stands for females) or "vryvryvrybrlylegal" or "Moms'nsnons" or "likemyung."

The Internet, like the telephone and automobile before it, has created new possibilities for crime. Some people wielding computers for criminal purposes are being combated by FBI agents working out of an office park in Calverton, Md.

The FBI operation, named Innocent Images, targets cyber-stalkers seeking sex with children, and traffickers in child pornography. As one agent here says, "Business is good—unfortunately." Criminal sexual activity on the Internet is a growth industry.

In many homes, children are the most competent computer users. They are as comfortable on the Internet as their parents are on the telephone. On the Web, children can be pen pals with the entire world, instantly and at minimal cost. But the world contains many bad people. Parents should take seriously a cartoon that shows two dogs working

on computers. One says to the other, "When you're online, no one knows you're a dog."

A child does not know if the person with whom he or she is chatting is another child or a much older person with sinister intentions. The typical person that the agents call a "traveler"—someone who will cross state lines hoping to have a sexual encounter with a child—is a white male age 25-45. He has above-average education—often an advanced degree, and he can find his way around the Internet—and above-average income, enabling him to travel. Many "travelers" are married.

But these cyber-stalkers do not know if the person with whom they are chatting is really, as they think, a young boy or girl, or an FBI agent. Some "travelers" who thought they had arranged meetings with children have been unpleasantly surprised, arrested, tried and jailed.

Since the first arrest under Innocent Images in 1995, there have been 487 arrests of "travelers" and pornographers, and 409 convictions. Most of the 78 nonconvictions are in cases still pending. The conviction rate is above 95 percent. However, the FBI is distressed by light sentences from some judges who justify their leniency by the fact that the offenders are socially upscale and first offenders. (Actually, probably not: How likely is it that they get caught the first time they become predators?) Lenient judges also call the crime "victimless" because it is an FBI agent, not a child, receiving the offender's attention.

Agents are trained to avoid entrapment, and predators usually initiate talk about sexual encounters. But children implicitly raise the subject by visiting such chat rooms. Most children recoil when sexual importunings become overt. ("When you come to meet me, make sure you're not wearing any underwear.") But some importunings, including gifts and sympathetic conversation about the problems of children, are cunning, subtle and effective.

Publicity about Innocent Images may deter some predators, but most are driven to risk-taking by obsessions. America Online and other service providers look for suspect chat rooms and close those they spot, but they exist in such rapidly changing profusion that there are always many menacing ones open.

Digital cameras, and the plunging price of computer storage capacity for downloaded photographs, have made this, so to speak, the golden age of child pornography. The fact that the mere possession of it is a crime does not deter people from finding, in the blizzard of Internet activities, like-minded people to whom they say things like, "I'm interested in pictures of boys 6 to 8 having sex with adults."

A booklet available from any FBI office, "A Parent's Guide to Internet Safety," lists signs that a child might be at risk online. These include the child's being online for protracted periods, particularly at night. Being online like that is the unenviable duty of FBI agents running Innocent Images.

Each of the FBI's 56 field offices has an officer trained to seek cyber-stalkers and traffickers in child pornography. Ten offices have Innocent Images operations. Agents assigned to Innocent Images can spend as many as 10 hours a day monitoring the sexual sewer that is a significant part of the "information superhighway." So the FBI looks for "reluctant volunteers" who, while working, are given psychological tests to see that they are not becoming "damaged goods." Whatever these agents are being paid, they are underpaid.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, as momentum builds for the deployment of missile defense and the abandonment of the obsolete ABM Treaty, those who oppose missile defense are getting more and more desperate in their arguments. One argument that we're hearing with more frequency is the threat of the suitcase bomb. This argument maintains that we shouldn't be spending our scarce defense dollars on ballistic missile defense when there are easier and cheaper ways a potential enemy could deliver a weapon of mass destruction to the United States. Rogue states could just smuggle a bomb in on a ship, or put it in a suitcase in New York, or drop biological weapons into our water supply. A missile defense system won't do anything to stop a suitcase bomb, so it must be a waste of money, or so the argument goes.

This argument is repeated with such frequency, it might be useful to state for the record why it misses the point.

Let me state the most obvious reason first. The presence of one kind of threat doesn't mean you shouldn't also defend against other threats. Imagine if this logic were applied consistently to our approach to national defense. Why have an army if you can be attacked by sea? Or, why have air defenses if you can be attacked by land? Such reasoning is absurd. If we refused to defend against one threat simply because other threats exist, we would end up completely defenseless.

National defense capabilities are like insurance policies: we hope we never have to use them, but the consequences of not having them could be catastrophic. No one would argue that because you have auto insurance you shouldn't also buy insurance for your house. However, opponents of missile defense argue that you don't need insurance against ballistic missiles, but that you only need insurance against suitcase bombs and other terrorist threats.

I think we would all agree that a potential adversary would likely try to exploit any perceived vulnerabilities in our defenses. This is only logical. If the U.S. forgoes the capability to repel a missile attack, that creates a powerful incentive for our adversaries to seek a ballistic missile capability. Once again, this is only logical.

I would like to emphasize that defending against the so-called suitcase bomb threats is not an alternative to defending against ballistic missiles, as opponents of missile defense assert. We must do both. We have an obligation to do both.

Keep in mind that terrorist acts, such as those that would be perpetrated by a suitcase bomb, serve purposes entirely different from ballistic missiles. The surreptitious placement and detonation of a weapon, such as occurred at the World Trade Center or in Oklahoma City, is intended to disrupt society by spreading terror. Such acts

depend on covert action and their goal is the actual use of the weapon. That's not why nations acquire ballistic missiles.

How many times have we heard opponents of missile defense drag out the tired cliché "Missiles have a return address!" as though that somehow devalues them. The opposite is true, missiles derive their value from the knowledge of their existence and the belief that they might be used. Of course they have a return address; their owners want to make sure we know it. The point is not, as it is with terrorist weapons, to hide the existence of ballistic missiles, but to broadcast it. The ability to coerce the United States with ballistic missiles depends on our belief that a potential adversary has nuclear missile and would be willing to use them against us. We called this principle deterrence when the Soviet Union was in existence. However, in the hands of a dictator, deterrence can quickly become coercion and blackmail.

Those who argue that missile defense is not necessary as long as a potential adversary could use a suitcase bomb erroneously assume that the goal of a rogue state in having a ballistic missile is to use it somewhere. This is not necessarily correct. These rogue states recognize that ballistic missiles armed with nuclear warheads provide an effective way to coerce the United States. Imagine a dictator who could stand up to the United States with a nuclear missile, knowing full well that there is nothing the United States can do to defend itself.

There is another huge difference between the terrorist act and the ballistic missile—we are actively fighting against terrorism but doing nothing whatsoever to protect ourselves against ballistic missiles. Last year, the United States spent around \$11 billion in counter terrorism programs, more than double what we spent on the entire missile defense program, including theater missile defenses. Spending this year on counter terrorism programs will be even higher. And that layer of defense is working, as evidenced last year by the successful interdiction of terrorist infiltration attempts on our northern border. Counter terrorism is an important aspect of our national security program and we need to continue to be vigilant and to dedicate the necessary resources to it. But we have no defense against ballistic missiles, and we cannot continue to have this glaring vulnerability in our defenses.

For those opponents of missile defense, I pose the following questions. Why are nations like North Korea and Iran spending billions of dollars on the development of ballistic missiles? Are they irrational, spending money on things they don't need? I think that's highly unlikely. I think a better explanation is that the leaders of such nations see tremendous value in such weapons. They understand that the

only way to counter the power of the United States and reduce its influence is to exploit its vulnerabilities. I think they have surveyed the landscape and have correctly perceived that our one glaring vulnerability is our utter defenselessness against ballistic missile attack. And I think they have realized that ballistic missiles, with their return address painted right on the side in big bright letters, can be instruments of coercion without ever being launched.

That is a purpose very different from the one served by suitcase bombs, and it is time opponents of missile defense stopped pretending otherwise.

THE FISCAL YEAR 2002 VA-HUD AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I regret that, once again, I was compelled to oppose this appropriations bill. At the outset, I should make it clear that there are many worthwhile items contained within it. Above all, I am pleased that the committee has provided significant increases in funding for veterans' health care, veterans' medical research, State veterans home construction and other vital programs that serve those who have sacrificed for our Nation.

Nevertheless, I cannot endorse the order of priority accorded to the various programs funded within this bill. I object to leaving veterans' needs unmet while funding hundreds of earmarked projects. And I regret that our appropriations process compels Members to, in effect, choose between voting for rightly popular veterans' programs and voting against wasteful social spending.

For a number of years, I have questioned the desirability of grouping agencies with unrelated missions into omnibus appropriations bills, and I have cited the VA-HUD bill as the best illustration of the problem. Despite my strong support for veterans benefits I have, more often than not, voted against the VA-HUD bill since I came to the Senate, because I believed that the spending levels and earmarks in the HUD portion could not be defended.

We all know that HUD is a Department fraught with serious problems, as detailed repeatedly by the General Accounting Office, which to this day, classifies HUD as the only "high risk" executive branch agency at the Cabinet level. Yet the bill before us provides HUD with a robust nine percent increase, bigger than the increase provided for veterans.

The HUD title also includes eleven pages of earmarked projects, the vast bulk of them in States represented by appropriators. If past history is any guide, the final list of earmarks will grow beyond what is in this bill, or the House bill.

Last night, I reluctantly voted against the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Minnesota, because I believed that the additional